

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/771,613	02/04/2004	Roger Keith Stager	ALA-PT011	3439
63983 VOLPE AND	7590 01/11/2007 KOENIG, P.C. NET APP	EXAMINER		
30 S. 17TH STREET			LE, DIEU MINH T	
UNITED PLAZA, SUITE 1600 PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103 ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
•	,	•	2114	
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
SHORTENED STATUTOR	RY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MC	ONTHS	01/11/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

		Application No.	Application No. Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/771,613	STAGER ET AL.				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Dieu-Minh Le	2114				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	ldress			
WHI(- Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status		la-C					
1) 又	£006 Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10/16, 12/14, 1/04,& interview 1/5/07.						
	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.						
′=	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
,	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims							
4) 又	4)⊠ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-16</u> is/are rejected.						
7)	_						
'=	Claim(s) is/are objected to:						
Application Papers							
	•	_					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
10) The drawing(s) filed on <u>04 February 2004</u> is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f).				
a)[☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:						
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents						
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	•	d in this National	Stage			
+ 0	application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
Attachmen	t(s)						
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)							
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date Notice of Informal Patent Application							
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/14/06, 1/4/07. 6) Other:							

DETAILED ACTION

- 1. This Office Action is in response to the amendment filed 10/16/2006 and the interview on 12/08/06, 12/21/06 and 01/05/2006 in application 10/771,613.
- 2. Claims 1-16 are again presented for examination.
- 3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- 4. Claims 1-16 are again rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zalewski et al. (U.S. 7,032,126 hereafter referred to as Zalewski_126) in view of Zalewski et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0010529 hereafter referred to as Zalewski 529).

This rejection is being applied for the same reasons set forth in the previous Office Action mailed 07/14/2006. As per claims 1-16 see the previous office action for the detailed teaching of Zalewskis as well as the reasons and motivation for combined.

Art Unit: 2114

Applicant asserts that Zalewski_126 and Zalewski_529 failed to teach or suggest the following:

- a. the primary volume can be rewound to any point in time, regardless of whether the primary volume is in a stable or not at the previous point in time;
- b. the concept of rewinding to "any point in time" (PIT).

Examiner respectfully transverses Applicant's argument as follows:

a. First, Examiner would like to bring Applicant attention to Zalewski_126's method and apparatus for creating a dynamic storage for data recovery and <u>continuous</u> data protection [abstract, fig.1-3, col. 1, lines 40-50; col. 2, lines 20-27]. Zalewski_126 clearly demonstrated <u>the failover operations, snapshot, and a point-in-time</u>

(APIT/PIT) capability used to support failover, data recovery/protection process including identifying data (i.e., previous state data), preventing data loss, etc... in a plurality of data storage volumes [fig. 1-3, col. 4, lines 30-50]. In addition, Zalewski 529 explicitly

Art Unit: 2114

illustrated the failover operations, snapshot, and <u>a point-in-time (APIT/PIT)</u> used to support failover, data recovery/protection process including data mirroring and policy in a plurality of data storage volumes including primary and secondary set of data [abstract, fig. 1-4, par. 0005, 0011,0017-0019]. It is clear that both Zalewski_126 and Zalewski 529 do teach applicant's invention.

Second, in response to Applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of Applicant's invention, it is noted that the feature upon which Applicant relies (i.e., the primary volume can be rewound to any point in time, regardless of whether the primary volume is in a stable or not at the previous point in time) is not recited in the rejected claim. Although the claims is interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification is not read into the claims. In re

Third, Zalewski_126 clearly demonstrated the failover
operations, snapshot, and-a-point-in-time (APIT/PIT)
capability used to support failover, data
data
recovery/protection-process-including-identifying-data,

Art Unit: 2114

preventing data loss, etc... in a plurality of data storage volumes [fig. 1-3, col. 4, lines 30-50]. Zalewski_126 further illustrated the capability of <u>data mapping</u>, reading, writing, mirroring, etc... (i.e., data structures) including data policy in supporting data detection, correction, and protection process [col. 3, lines 55 through col. 4, lines 50].

Therefore, it is obvious to an ordinary skill in the art that the combination of the Zalewski_126 and Zalewski_529's inventions do clearly teach applicant's limitation.

b. First, it is <u>not</u> true that both Zalewski_126 and Zalewski_529 failed to teach "the concept of rewinding to "any point in time" (PIT)". This is because Zalewski_126 demonstrated capability for creating a dynamic storage for data recovery and <u>continuous</u> data protection [abstract, fig.1-3, col. 1, lines 40-50; col. 2, lines 20-27]. Furthermore, Zalewski_529 explicitly illustrated the failover operations, snapshot, and <u>a point-in-time</u>

(APIT/PIT) used to support failover, data recovery/protection process including data mirroring and policy in a plurality of data storage volumes including primary and secondary set of data [abstract, fig. 1-4, par.

Art Unit: 2114

0005, 0011,0017-0019]. By performing <u>data protection</u>

<u>continuously</u> process, data can be rewound at any point in time in supporting the continuously data protection within data storage system.

Second, Zalewski_126 applied the failover operations, snapshot, and a point-in-time (APIT/PIT) capability to perform failover, data recovery/protection process including identifying data (i.e., previous state data), preventing data loss, etc... in a plurality of data storage volumes [fig. 1-3, col. 4, lines 30-50]. By utilizing the snapshot technology therein, data within memory volume can be rewound to any point in time (PIT) in order to perform data/error detection, protection, and correction process [col. 4, lines 20-50].

Third, as indicate in previous office action that the combination of Zalewski_126's <u>failover operations</u>,

<u>snapshot</u>, and a point-in-time (APIT/PIT) used to support

<u>failover</u>, data recovery/protection process including

<u>identifying data (i.e., previous state data)</u>, preventing

<u>data loss</u>, etc... in a plurality of data storage volumes and

Zalewski 529's applying the failover operations, snapshot,

Art Unit: 2114

and a point-in-time (APIT/PIT) used to support failover, data recovery/protection process including data mirroring and policy in a plurality of data storage volumes including primary and secondary set of data do teach applicant's invention. By utilizing this approach, the multi-data storage volumes data system including backup capability (i.e., OS failover) can enhance its operation performance, more specifically to ensuring the error detected, corrected, and replaced (i.e., backup) in proper and efficient manner.

Applicant's arguments filed 10/16/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a).

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST RESPONSE IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE-MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

Page 8

Art Unit: 2114

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dieu-Minh Le whose telephone number is (571) 272-3660. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday from 8:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Scott Baderman can be reached on (571)272-3644.

The Tech Center 2100 phone number is (571) 272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DIEU-MINH THAI LE PRIMARY EXAMINER ART UNIT 2114

DML 01/07/06